UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,733	11/09/2001	Narendran Ramakrishnan	01640279AA	5865

7590   04/29/2004

LAW OFFICES
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD, SUITE 340
P.O. Box 9204
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER
THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	7

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11/9/01_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-12_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,2 and 4-12_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _3_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _12 December 2002_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _5_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

This is in response to application filed November 9, 2001 in which claims 1-12 are

presented for examination.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999

(AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002

do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed on or after November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA

35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

1.   Claims 1-2, 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schmidt-

Joos et al (WO 01/86368).

Regarding claim 1, Schmidt-Joos discloses a systematic modeling methodology for

information personalization in an information system which automatically adjusts information

content, structure, and presentation to an individual user (see [0011], Schmidt-Joos) comprising

the steps of:

- modeling information-seeking interaction sequences with the information

    system wherein each interaction sequence denotes a possible dialog between the

    user and the information system (see [0009], Schidt-Joos);

- programmatically representing the interaction sequences in a computer program

    (see [0012]; [0069] and Fig.3 Schidt-Joos);

- creating a personalization system by partial evaluation of the computer program

    to produce a simplified program (see [0010]; [0083]; [0079]; step 13, Fig.1 and

    corresponding text, Schidt-Poos); and

- generating a personalized information space for the user in a user interface from

    the simplified program (see [0028]; [0092]; [0096], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 2, Schidt-Joos further discloses that a dialog in the step of modeling is a

task-oriented information-seeking activity involving a list of information-seeking aspects

comprising structural aspects specified by the user and terminal aspects as responses by the

information system to the specified structural aspects (see [0043], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 4, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of compacting interaction

sequences to determine a new set of interaction sequences having fewer states prior to the step of

programmatically representing the interaction sequences in a computer program (see [0025],

Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 5, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of creating a personalization

system by partial evaluation of the computer program uses a source-to-source transformation

engine that simplifies the computer program for static values of some program variables (see

[0020] and [0089], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 6, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of generating a personalized

information space for the user in a user interface is performed by mapping from the simplified

program to the information space, in terms of a technology corresponding to the information

system (see [0086] and [0090], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 7, Schidt-Joos further discloses that the information-seeking interaction

of the user is by means of a browser (see [0086], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 8, Schidt-Joos further discloses that the user interface is a browser

window displaying an information space and a partial input specification window for facilitating

user interaction (see [0016], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 9, Schidt-Joos further discloses that the browser supports a browsing

hierarchy, said step of modeling being performed using a nested programmatic model (see

[0016] and [0028], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 10, Schidt-Joos further discloses that the user interface comprises two

windows, a first window allowing the user to proceed with an interaction along lines initiated by

the information system and a second window allowing the user to take an initiative and

personalize the interaction by specifying some aspect out-of-turn (see [0016], Schidt-Joos). The

"server" and "client" computers correspond to the first window and send window.

Regarding claim 11, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of partially evaluating the

program with respect to values for structural program variables (see [0020], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 12, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of representing the

information-seeking aspects as values for structural program variables; performing a partial

evaluation with respect to the structural program variables (see steps 12, 14-15, Fig.1 and

corresponding text, Schidt-Joos).

Schidt, however, does not disclose the step of converting a resulting program back to the

information space. But Schidt discloses the step of generating a personalized information space

for the user in a user interface from the simplified program (see [0028]; [0092]; [0096], Schidt-

Joos). Therefore, the system of Schidt will be able to convert a program back to the information

space.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and

any intervening claims.

3.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the

prior art fail to suggest or disclose "organizing the set of interaction sequences in terms of

conditional elements on structural variables, using constructs provided in a programming

language; declaring all structural variables to be parameters in the program; and if an interaction

sequence produces values for terminal aspects, assigning values for respective terminal variables

in corresponding programmatic representation."

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

1. Fratkina et al. (US 2001/0049688) disclose the system and method for providing an

intelligent multi-step dialog with user.

2. O'Neil et al. (US 6,339,644) disclose method and apparatus for intelligent data

network call spawning system.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh Thai
Art Unit 2171
April 16, 2004

UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER